

April 23, 1969

Mr. Joseph A. Ball  
Ball, Hunt and Hart  
120 Linden Ave.,  
Long Beach, Calif. 90802

Dear Mr. Ball,

You persist in playing dirty pool. This requires that I write you and make <sup>the</sup> record. Someday, I will use it to counteract what you have done, for you give me no alternative.

I have the account of your speech before the Omaha Bar Association from the World-Herald of 4/11/69. I presume it is correct. Here again, the record between us gives me little choice, for when that defamation of me attributed to you in the New York Times elicited your complaint you had been misquoted; you refused to write the Times so stating. Had your claim been true, the course of honor demanded you write this letter. Are you not a man of honor?

The paper says you said Garrison used evidence "the commission had rejected as unreliable".

Garrison used the testimony of Colonel Pierre Finck (coming from my research in one of my limited editions). Colonel Finck testified that the autopsy doctors were under military control, that a general officer limited what they could do, that they were told not to "trace" the path of the so-called non fatal bullet through the body. I ask that you show me where the Commission rejected this testimony as "unreliable", where the Commission considered it at all, where, in any extension of the existing record, as you elect to interpret this, the Commission or any of the staff even considered such evidence. I tell you my source for what I have written is the Commission's files, for there I found exactly this, entirely ignored and painfully obvious.

You are also quoted as saying Roger Craig's testimony "was refuted by three other witnesses who said they saw Oswald leave the book depository". I ask you if there are such witnesses, such testimony or anything that the reporter might have misinterpreted this way.

Your sanctimony will eventually plague you more than your performance. That can be excused on the ground American lawyers are not prepared to meet obligations imposed by the lack of an adversary under the adversary system of justice. These nasty cracks you go around making, cowardly as they are when you refuse to confront those you slander - and unfactual - have no such excuse. I predict you will wind up full of regret that those of you who are rich lawyers and failed in the absence of an adversary made no effort to buy back what might remain of your reputations by supporting those who seek to do that which you had the responsibility of doing and didn't. Do not be deceived by the silence. I have completed three books (in two of which you figure) and have more material than I need for that many more. History will "bear you out", but in deep mourning.

Stanley Harold Wechsberg